

### REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 9 has been canceled (claims 6, 7, 11, 14-17, 19-20, 22 and 23 were previously canceled). Claims 1, 8, 18 and 24 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, 21 and 24 remain in the application. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 recites: a reflective display apparatus comprising:

a first liquid crystal cell, said first liquid crystal cell comprising a plurality of first full-color pixel elements configured to produce full-color images, said first pixel elements being controllable between a non-reflective state, in which electromagnetic radiation having a first polarization is reflected to a first extent, and a reflective state, in which said electromagnetic radiation having a first polarization is reflected to a second extent, said second extent being greater than said first extent, wherein the first liquid crystal cell is further configured to reflect electromagnetic radiation of the first polarization according to a first perspective view of a full-color image in a first direction; and

a second liquid crystal cell, said second liquid crystal cell comprising a plurality of second full-color pixel elements configured to produce full-color images, said second pixel elements being controllable between a non-reflective state, in which electromagnetic radiation having a second polarization is reflected to a third extent, and a reflective state, in which said electromagnetic radiation having a second polarization is reflected to a fourth extent, said fourth extent being greater than said third extent, wherein the second liquid crystal cell is

further configured to reflect electromagnetic radiation of the second polarization according to a second perspective view of the full-color image in a second direction, the first perspective view being separate from the second perspective view, and the first direction being different from the second direction, further characterized in that said first and second liquid crystal cells are configured so that said first polarization is different from said second polarization.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present application. Support for the amendments to claim 1 (including amendments to claims 8 and 18), can be found in the specification at least on page 6, line 7; page 7, lines 12-14; page 9, line 15; page 12, lines 15-18; and page 13, lines 3-7.

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12, 13, 18, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hiji et al. (US 6,580,482). With respect to claim 9, the same has been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of the same now moot. With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131 that  
*"[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."*

Therefore, with respect to claim 1, to sustain this rejection the Hiji reference must contain all of the above claimed elements of the respective claims. However, contrary to the examiner's position that all elements are disclosed in the Hiji reference, the latter reference does not disclose a "... first liquid crystal cell ... comprising a plurality of *first full-color pixel elements* configured to produce full-color images ... further configured to reflect electromagnetic radiation ... according to a *first perspective view* of a full-color image *in a first direction*; and a second liquid crystal cell ... comprising a plurality of *second full-color pixel elements* configured to produce full-color images ... further

configured to reflect electromagnetic radiation ... according to a *second perspective view* of the full-color image in a *second direction*, the *first perspective view* being *separate from* the *second perspective view*, and the *first direction* being *different from* the *second direction*, further ... in that ... said *first polarization* is different from said *second polarization* ..." as is claimed in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the Hiji reference and should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. Dependent claims 2-5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, 21 and 24 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

### **Conclusion**

Except as indicated herein, the claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve their right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or a continuation application.

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, 21 and 24 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well.

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings, therefore, no new matter is introduced. Issuance of an early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, 21 and 24 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael J. Balconi-Lamica*

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica  
Registration No. 34,291  
for Frank Keegan, Reg. No. 50,145

Dated: Nov. 24, 2007

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
345 Scarborough Road  
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510  
Telephone: 914-333-9669  
Facsimile: 914-332-0615  
File: NL020620US

a-32658.181